

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1, 2, 5-11, 13-28, 30-33, 66 and 69-80 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 2, 23 and 66 being the independent claims. By the foregoing amendments, claims 1, 2, 9-11, 13-15, 23, 26, 27, 28, 66 and 72 have been amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 2, 9-11, 13-15, 23, 27, 28, 66 and 72 can be found throughout the specification, specifically at page 25. Claim 33 has been amended to refer to a “kit” rather than a “method.” Claim 26 has been amended to recite the term “said.” New claims 73-80 are sought to be added. Support for new claims 73-80 may be found throughout the specification, specifically at page 25. No new matter is added by way of these amendments, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-2, 5-11, 13-28, 30-33, 66 and 69-72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the phrase “substantially reduced” was characterized as indefinite. Office Action at page 2, section 3.a. Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization. However, in an earnest effort to advance prosecution of the application, the claims have been amended to no longer recite the language characterized as indefinite.

Claim 33 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, due to recitation of “the method of claim 31.” Claim 31 has been amended to properly refer to a kit rather than a method.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, Applicants request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the all presently outstanding rejections. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Brian J. Del Buono
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,473

Date: Nov. 3, 2004

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600